



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

DA  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,444	11/03/2003	Shui-Yi Lee	MR929-935	3743
7590	02/11/2005		EXAMINER	
Morton J. Rosenberg, Esq. Rosenberg, Klein & Lee Suite 101 3458 Ellicott Center Drive Ellicott City, MD 21043			FLORES SANCHEZ, OMAR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
			DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/698,444	LEE ET AL. <i>(CD)</i>	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Omar Flores-Sánchez	3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                             |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                                |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|                                                                                                                        | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the lug 451 as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goto et al. (6408750 B1) in view of Lemens et al. (6742428 B2) and Johnson (3385149).

Regarding claim 1, Goto et al. discloses (Fig. 1-23) the invention substantially as claimed including a cover 310 having a front side, two side portions and a seat; a longitudinal blade assembly (see Fig. 7), a first axle 54, a second axle 53, a slot (69 and 70)(see Fig. 5 and 8), multiple ring blades (62-65), multiple sleeves (53b and 54b), a transversal blade assembly (Fig. 13), a blade seat 230 and a circular blade 220. Regarding claim 2, Goto et al. teaches a groove (see Fig. 14). Regarding claims 1, 3 and 7, Goto et al. does not show an U-like notch, a first shaft, a second shaft, a knob and a handle. Regarding claim 5, Goto et al. teaches a shield 72. However, Lemens et al. teaches the use of an U-like notch (see Fig. 4), a knob 36 and a handle 82 for the purpose of reducing manufacturing cost. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Goto's device by providing the U-like notch, the knob and the handle as taught by Lemens in order to reduce the manufacturing cost.

Regarding the first and second shafts, Johnson teaches the use of shafts 87 for the purpose of permitting easily removal of a carriage 77 and easily movement of the carriage. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have modified Goto's device by providing the shafts as taught by Johnson in order to obtain a device that permits easily removal of a carriage and easily movement of the carriage.

Regarding claims 4 and 6, Goto et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a paper dispenser 334 and an adjusting stop 336. Goto et al. does not show the paper dispenser located at the rear side. However, Lemens et al. teaches the use of a paper dispenser 48 located at the rear side for the purpose of more easily loading papers. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Goto's paper dispenser by providing the paper dispenser located at the rear side as taught by Lemens in order to more easily loading papers to the dispenser.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goto et al. (6408750 B1) in view of Lemens et al. (6742428 B2) and Johnson (3385149) as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Beno et al. (4957235).

The modified device of Goto et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for an axle hole, two positioning recesses and a pole having a lug. However, Beno et al. teaches the use of an axle hole (see Fig. 6), positioning recess 30 and a pole 29 having a lug for the purpose of locking the shaft 33 and the blade. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Goto's knob by providing the axle hole, two positioning recesses and the pole as taught by Beno et al. in order to obtain a device that locks the shaft and the blade to avoid any undesired cut on the paper.

Art Unit: 3724

***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Johnson, Kercher et al., Westover, Bradshaw, Bradshaw et al., Shimizu, Ensign, Jr. et al. and Seki et al. are cited to show related device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Omar Flores-Sánchez whose telephone number is 571-272-4507. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ofs  
February 9, 2005

  
Allan N. Shoap  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700